



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/629,464	07/31/2000	Hiroiyuki Sayuda	046601-5056	5381

9629 7590 03/15/2005

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, JAMES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

87

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/629,464

Applicant(s)

SAYUDA, HIROYUKI

Examiner

James A Thompson

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2004 and 04 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, dated 04 October 2004, have been fully considered. Applicant's arguments are based on the amendments to the claims, which have been entered after Applicant's filing of a Request for Continued Examination, dated 01 December 2004.

Examiner agrees that Applicant's amendments distinguish the claims over the previously cited prior art (US Patent 5,710,636 to Curry and US Patent 5,884,014 to Huttenlocher). However, additional art has been found which teaches the limitations of the claims as currently filed. A detailed discussion of the prior art rejections is given below.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 1-6 and 8-17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, lines 7-8 and claim 10, lines 6-7 are not grammatically correct. Both claim 1, lines 7-8 and claim 10, lines 6-7 should be changed to "wherein a configuration of pixels plotted in embedded areas is different from that in ordinary plotting areas." These alterations will correct the grammar and make the language consistent with the language on page 7, lines 15-16 of Applicant's arguments, dated 04 October 2004.

Claims 2-6 and 8-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and are therefore also objected to.

Claims 11-17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 10 and are therefore also objected to.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2624

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (US Patent 6,138,151) in view of Bhattacharjya (US Patent 6,456,393 B1).

**Regarding claims 1 and 10:** Reber discloses an image processing apparatus (figure 1 of Reber) comprising an input part (figure 1(44) of Reber) that inputs hyperdocument data (column 5, lines 21-28 of Reber) and coupling information (column 5, lines 11-13 of Reber) for specifying related information related to an image element constituting a document image (column 5, lines 14-17 of Reber); and an embedding part (figure 1(46) of Reber) that embeds the coupling information to be superimposed over at least part of the document (column 7, lines 13-17 of Reber) to form the document image of the hyperdocument data inputted by the input part (column 7, lines 3-12 of Reber), wherein a configuration of pixels plotted in embedded areas is different from that in ordinary plotting areas (column 7, lines 16-19 of Reber). Since the embedded coupling information is a printed code (column 5, lines 18-22 of Reber) that is to be read by a computer to obtain hyperdocument information (column 5, lines 25-29 and lines 38-40 of Reber), the configuration of pixels plotted in embedded areas is

Art Unit: 2624

different from that in ordinary plotting areas (column 7, lines 16-19 of Reber).

Reber does not disclose expressly that said coupling information is embedded over at least part of the image element.

Bhattacharjya discloses embedding computer-readable information (figure 3(30) and column 3, lines 8-17 of Bhattacharjya) over at least part of an image element (figure 5 (32) and column 3, lines 44-51 of Bhattacharjya).

Reber and Bhattacharjya are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital information embedding and encoding. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to embed the coupling information taught by Reber using the method taught by Bhattacharjya through which digital data is encoded directly and unobtrusively on associated text data. The computer-readable information taught by Bhattacharjya would be the coupling information taught by Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to embed said coupling data without affecting the document's appearance to a human reader (column 1, lines 58-63 of Bhattacharjya). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bhattacharjya with Reber to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 10.

Further regarding claim 10: The apparatus of claim 1 performs the method of claim 10.

**Further regarding claims 2 and 11:** Bhattacharjya discloses that the document data contains appearance information (column 3, lines 3-9 of Bhattacharjya) that defines the image formation positions of the image element on the document image (column 3, lines 8-9 of Bhattacharjya), and embedding is performed based on the appearance information (column 3, lines 8-12 of

Art Unit: 2624

Bhattacharjya). As discussed above in the arguments regarding claims 1 and 10, embedding is performed with the embedding part taught by Reber.

**Regarding claims 3 and 12:** Reber discloses that the coupling information indicates a location of the related information (column 5, lines 21-29 of Reber).

**Regarding claims 4 and 13:** Reber discloses that the coupling information specifies information indicative of a location of the related information (column 5, lines 21-29 of Reber).

**Regarding claims 5 and 14:** Reber does not disclose expressly that the coupling information specifies the related information itself.

Bhattacharjya discloses embedding the related information itself into the document data (column 3, lines 8-12 of Bhattacharjya).

Reber and Bhattacharjya are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital information embedding and encoding. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to embed the related information itself, as taught by Bhattacharjya. The suggestion for doing so would have been that, using the method taught by Bhattacharjya, one can embed data unobtrusively (column 1, lines 58-63 of Bhattacharjya) and thus one could simply embed the related information itself, as taught by Bhattacharjya, instead of only the location of the related information, as taught by Reber. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bhattacharjya with Reber to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 14.

**Further regarding claims 6 and 15:** Bhattacharjya discloses embedding the coupling information in a form or color in which the coupling information is difficult to identify visually (column 3, lines 12-17 and column 1, lines 58-63 of Bhattacharjya). As discussed above in the arguments regarding claims 1 and 10, embedding is performed with the embedding part taught by Reber.

**Further regarding claims 8 and 16:** Bhattacharjya discloses that the appearance information is based on logical information (column 3, lines 5-9 of Bhattacharjya). Detecting text blocks clearly requires logical information upon which to base said detection.

**Regarding claims 9 and 17:** Reber discloses an identification generator (figure 1(10) of Reber) that generates identification (column 3, lines 65-67 of Reber) and manages correspondences between the identification and the coupling information (column 5, lines 11-13 and lines 18-22 of Reber).

**Regarding claim 7:** Reber discloses an image forming medium (figure 1(12) of Reber) on which an image constituted by an image element is formed (column 3, lines 38-44 of Reber), wherein coupling information (column 5, lines 11-13 of Reber) from hyperdocument data (column 5, lines 25-29 of Reber) for specifying related information relating to the image element is embedded (column 7, lines 12-19 of Reber).

Reber does not disclose expressly that said coupling information is superimposed over at least part of the image element.

Bhattacharjya discloses embedding computer-readable information (figure 3(30) and column 3, lines 8-17 of

Art Unit: 2624

Bhattacharjya) over at least part of an image element (figure 5 (32) and column 3, lines 44-51 of Bhattacharjya).

Reber and Bhattacharjya are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital information embedding and encoding. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to embed the coupling information taught by Reber using the method taught by Bhattacharjya through which digital data is encoded directly and unobtrusively on associated text data. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to embed said coupling data without affecting the document's appearance to a human reader (column 1, lines 58-63 of Bhattacharjya). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bhattacharjya with Reber to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

**Regarding claim 18:** Reber discloses an image processing apparatus (figure 1 of Reber) comprising an input part (figure 1 (44) of Reber) that inputs hyperdocument data (column 5, lines 21-28 of Reber) and coupling information (column 5, lines 11-13 of Reber) for specifying related information related to an image element constituting a document image (column 5, lines 14-17 of Reber); and an embedding part (figure 1(46) of Reber) that embeds the coupling information to be superimposed over at least part of the document (column 7, lines 13-17 of Reber) to form the document image of the hyperdocument data inputted by the input part (column 7, lines 3-12 of Reber).

Reber does not disclose expressly that said coupling information is embedded over at least part of the image element; and that image concentration of the coupling information is changed depending on image concentration of an area which the coupling information is embedded.



Art Unit: 2624

Bhattacharjya discloses embedding computer-readable information (figure 3(30) and column 3, lines 8-17 of Bhattacharjya) over at least part of an image element (figure 5 (32) and column 3, lines 44-51 of Bhattacharjya); and changing the image concentration of the computer-readable information depending on image concentration of an area in which the computer-readable information is embedded (column 3, lines 36-43 of Bhattacharjya). The image concentration of embedded computer-readable information depends upon how the concentration of text present and the precise manner in which the pixels comprising the text portion of the image are arranged (column 3, lines 36-43 of Bhattacharjya).

Reber and Bhattacharjya are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital information embedding and encoding. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to embed the coupling information taught by Reber using the method taught by Bhattacharjya through which digital data is encoded directly and unobtrusively on associated text data. The computer-readable information taught by Bhattacharjya would be the coupling information taught by Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to embed said coupling data without affecting the document's appearance to a human reader (column 1, lines 58-63 of Bhattacharjya). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bhattacharjya with Reber to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

**Further regarding claims 19 and 20:** Bhattacharjya discloses that computer-readable data encoding is performed by darkening a site and then not darkening a site (binary 1) or not darkening a site and then darkening a site (binary 0) (column 3,

Art Unit: 2624

lines 44-49 of Bhattacharjya). The encoding processing is performed based on the assumption that the original text pixels are not at maximum darkness (column 3, lines 12-17 of Bhattacharjya). Therefore, areas in which the image has a higher level of maximum darkness text pixels, less computer-readable data can be encoded. Likewise, areas in which the image has a lower level of maximum darkness text pixels, more computer-readable data can be encoded. Therefore, the image concentration of the computer-readable information, which corresponds to the coupling information taught by Reber, increases when the image concentration of the area is lower than a predetermined value, and the image concentration of the computer-readable information decreases when the image concentration of the area is higher than a predetermined value.

### **Conclusion**

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rodriguez et al., US Patent 6,681,028 B2, 20 January 2004. This patent anticipates most or all of the claimed invention under 35 USC 102(e). This patent was filed approximately seven months before the foreign priority date of present application and claims priority of parts of the patent specification through a continuation-in-part filing.

Kessenich et al., US Patent 6,034,680, 07 March 2000. This patent teaches aspects of the claimed invention, such as data which relates a printed document to hyperdocument.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A Thompson whose telephone number is 703-305-6329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K Moore can be reached on 703-308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Thompson  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2624

JAT  
04 March 2005



THOMAS D  
TOMMY LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER